HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* — *Contributing Editors:* FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

Volume XII, No. 9 — Saturday, February 26, 1955 — Washington, D. C.

The Big Issue: The really big battle of the week is not between Ike and Speaker Sam Rayburn on taxes. It is between the President and his party leader in the Senate, Bill Knowland of California, on the issue of American independence vs. subordination of the U.S. to a world government. Thus, at least, realistic observers read the news, especially the news played down on the far inside pages of the great metropolitan dailies which apparently seek to obscure the issue from the public.

On Capitol Hill and along diplomatic row, it is believed that Knowland has information about a developing scheme, to which some of Ike's "liberal" advisers in the White House are a party, for slipping the United States into a world government, under the threat of atomic warfare and growing Soviet belligerence.

On February 18 in San Francisco, Knowland launched an attack on — or rather performed a cruel clinical dissection of — the United Nations. Four days later, on Washington's Birthday, he followed this up with an even stronger assault on the international body before a dinner of the Sons of the American Revolution in the Waldorf in New York. The first speech was not reported the day after in the Eastern metropolitan press. The second speech received notice in the *New York Times* on page 8. It is significant, also, that the *Daily Worker* devoted keen attention to the latter and that Communists picketed the Waldorf dinner.

These addresses — it is said — were motivated by information (which the California Senator presumably had received from sources within the Executive branch) of plans for a pattern of foreign policy perilous to American independence. Hence, he stepped up his pace of attacks, as follows:

(1) In his San Francisco speech last week he opposed: (a) any modification of our constitutional freedoms by any international body; and (b) he demanded that any candidate for public office — "executive, legislative, *judicial*" (our emphasis) — should forthrightly give his views on this issue, which is the basic issue raised by the Bricker Amendment. Knowland's inclusion of the word "judicial" means one thing to Washington: it means Judge Harlan, justice-designate to the Supreme Court, whose confirmation by the Senate is expected to arouse opposition. For, Harlan's views on the surrender of our sovereignty to an international organization (he is a member of "Union Now") have drawn fire.

(2) In his Waldorf talk, Knowland came closer to urging withdrawal of the U.S. from the UN than he had previously.

The day after the Knowland address in New York, the President took sharp exception to the Senator's remarks and praised the United Nations.

Hence, observers here perceive the makings of a first-class storm beside which the $20 tax reduction matter would look like a mere squall in a teacup.

Rayburn's $20 Tax Cut: Income taxes go up one way and down another.

When taxes were being raised, the higher bracket people had to take the same proportional increase as the lower bracket people. For example, when the rate was upped by one-half for the worker paying a $50 tax, the rate had to be upped one-half for the man paying a 40 percent tax. The 50 percent jump reduced the small fellow's income by only 1 or 2 or 3 percent; it slashed the big fellow's income by one-third or more.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

However, New Dealers now insist that a consistent principle — change taxes by the same proportions — should be forgotten when taxes are to be reduced. Look at the difference in savings, they cry, if big and little people should all be given a cut of one-third. A big fellow might get a saving of, say, $20,000 at the same time that a little fellow got only a saving of $20. True, in these two cases, the big fellow would still suffer, for he would be paying $40,000 in taxes, while the little fellow would be paying only $40. But it is still an outrage. When cuts in taxes are to be made, New Dealers insist that the comparison must be shown only of the savings to each and not of the taxes still to be paid.

Speaker Rayburn (who thinks Senator McCarthy is a demagogue!) now proposes a cut of $20 per taxpayer and dependent.

The head of a family of 5 who is now paying $10,000 would, after the cut, have to pay $9,900. Percentage cut, one percent! But the head of a family of 5 now paying $200 would hereafter have to pay only $100, a cut of fifty percent. If this "little fellow" is now paying $100, the reduction would be total — 100 percent. This inconsistent Rayburn formula, in fact, would end the federal income tax for an estimated 5,000,000 persons.

Political Talk: A lot of exhaustive discussion about the decision of both parties to hold late conventions, in August, 1956, brings forth a stubborn contention that the party chiefs thereby seek to ward off possibility of "third party" candidates. Canvassing sentiment among Southern Democratic leaders at a Washington gathering over the weekend, we found this belief very strong. Contact by telephone with western Republicans revealed similar views. Even under the old system of late June and July conventions, party bolters had insufficient time to create and get under way a new slate of candidates. Observers have long held that the Southern State Rights Party in 1948 would have made greater gains if more time had been available to organize.

● Sober thoughts about the GOP future followed the warning last week from Senator Goldwater, head of the GOP Senatorial elections committee, that 10 GOP Senate seats will be in "great danger" in 1956, while only two Democratic posts face similar peril. Goldwater's outburst was a wholesome reminder of a bad situation.

● Following the Goldwater forebodings, Representative Sheehan (R., Ill.) wrote Chairman Len Hall that "there are sections of the country wherein Mr. Eisenhower's popularity is not as great as you seem to think it is." Sheehan recalled the dismal showing of Republicans last November in Illinois and compared it with the previous off-year election of 1950 when they had done well. "The difference," said Sheehan, "was due to the fact that many of Senator McCarthy's followers failed to vote because they did not like the treatment accorded him by the Republican Party; and also a great many rank-and-file Republicans were not too enthusiastic about Mr. Eisenhower's program and his popularity." Also, the Illinois Representative expressed discontent with the dominance in the Administration of Easterners. And all this sobering picture is drawn against a backdrop of Ike's words, "Our greatest enemy is not the Democrats." Many Republicans find his words scarcely exhilarating.

Foreign Aid Waste: In July of 1954 the Investigations Division of the Senate Appropriations Committee issued a confidential report to the Committee members. It warned that we were pouring hundreds of millions into the production of military aircraft by British manufacturers, although such aircraft had not been fully approved by our Air Force. It said that a large part of the proposed aircraft when delivered would be obsolete (i.e., in terms of our own and enemy progress.)

This report "leaked" and Harold Stassen, FOA Chief whose agency was handing out the subsidies to British aircraft manufacturers, indignantly attacked it. Stassen said that it "is one of the most in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accurate reports I have ever seen." He pointed out that we ordered for NATO only those planes which had been evaluated by our Air Force and he particularly praised the Hawker-Hunter type of plane which our money was producing for the British RAF. He further said that the Hawker-Hunter type had been evaluated "as top flight when it was in the development stage and it has proven out in its production."

Fifteen days after Stassen's statement the *Evening Standard* of London (August 28, 1954) reported that the Hawker-Hunter type (just being supplied in small quantities) was obsolescent compared with better planes going to the American Air Force. In the London *Daily Express* three months later, W. A. Waterton, noted British test pilot, said that the latest RAF fighters "are already outclassed by American types." Early this month the press reported that the Hawker-Hunter type was so defective, that when its cannon was fired the motor stopped.

In the House of Commons, there has been considerable uproar over the obsolescence of the Hawker-Hunter model and other British planes subsidized by the U.S. But Churchill has refused to appoint a Royal Commission to look into the "mess."

Pentagon sources say that initially the Hawker-Hunter type was inspected and certain changes recommended, but thereafter British manufacturers added more changes not approved — changes responsible for its defectiveness. On other British models (such as the "Swift" which is reported to be worse than the Hawker-Hunter) no full evaluation was made.

We are reportedly pledged to some $341,000,000 for British planes. A very high percentage of this sum — it is said — could be saved if we used a small part to pay for what defective or obsolescent planes had been produced and then demanded a completely new shuffle. But so far Stassen has apparently remained passive. This gives rise to the suspicion that our money was intended primarily to support the British budget and that we do not want to stop the flow of dollars even though the product may be worthless.

Democrats and Communists: The so-called "smart boys" in the Capitol have made a shibboleth of the proposition: The Eisenhower Administration has taken away from the Democrats the welfare-state and socialistic program, leaving the opposition party no "give-away" issues with which to ride back into power in 1956. But other observers here believe a greater weakness of the Democrats is that they are more open to the charge of "soft on Communism" than the GOP Administration. Instead of taking the ball away from McCarthy, instead of probing and criticising McCarthy's enemies in the Republican Administration, the Democrats line up against the Wisconsin Senator and his following. Thus, they desert the obvious role of an Opposition and thereby lose a clearly popular appeal to the electorate.

In such a weak posture, the Democrats are the natural objective of the Communists who want to capture or at least indirectly shape the Democratic national policy. During the last election campaign, the Communist Party, in a pamphlet "The American Way" (published by New Century Publishers, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N.Y.), baldly called on Communist Party members to infiltrate the ranks and capture the policy of the Democrats. On page 10 of the brochure, the Party members are exhorted in the following words:

"To unite a new political majority for 1954 and 1956 requires recognition that the two-party system remains the form through which the overwhelming majority of the American people now express themselves in politics. Except in special local and state situations, there is no immediate prospect that decisively large masses will break away from the existing two-party structure. This is particularly true since the struggle between the McCarthy and anti-McCarthy forces is likely to be very close. Under these circumstances, the decisive sections of organized labor, without which a mass third party is impossible, will first attempt to fight out the issues within the ranks of the Democratic Party."

(See column 1, page 4)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Then the pamphlet goes on about how "the 1954 elections are crucial in determining the path America will take;" and how McCarthy "has thrown down the gauntlet to the American people;" how it is necessary to elect "an anti-McCarthy Congress by defeating every McCarthy-McCarran-Dixiecrat type of candidate." Senator Wayne Morse, new convert to the Democratic ranks, could not have put the matter more forcibly than this official Communist appeal to "bring in to the halls of Congress a bloc of articulate and uncompromising opponents of McCarthyism." And Walter Reuther, power in the left-wing of the Democratic party, now that he has brought about union with the AFL, will find guidance in the C.P. pamphlet observation "about the many important battles it [the Communist Party] must wage within the Democratic Party."

Reclamation: Those unhappy taxpayers who resent paying taxes for TVA to subsidize low power rates for consumers in the Tennessee region may now take a good look at a similar boondoggle out west — indeed perhaps the first boondoggle of this "handout" century. Dr. Raymond Moley throws the spotlight on Federal aid to the irrigation of arid portions of western states. This is a levy on the public purse of no mean proportions — running to over a billion dollars of appropriations in the years 1947-51.

In a pamphlet entitled "What Price Reclamation?", (published by the American Enterprise Association, Inc., 1012-14th Street, N.W., Washington 5, D. C. Price $1), Dr. Moley recounts the uninspiring history of this earliest of ventures in wasting congressional appropriations.

It all began back in 1902 with the enactment of the Federal Reclamation Act. President Theodore Roosevelt sought to help irrigation by this law, with the innocent determination that the Federal government should get back the original investment. President William Howard Taft began to realize that any such hopes were dim and by the Twenties, during an agricultural depression, the interest-free subsidies were in full swing on a grand scale and dates of repayment were being extended forty years. Under Herbert Hoover, there appeared a chance — with new and sounder financial arrangements — that reclamation would enter a healthier phase. But the great depression intervened and the Franklin D. Roosevelt regime performed wonders — with numerous bookkeeping devices under fancy names — in covering up the truth that the Federal Treasury had been fleeced.

Dr. Moley makes vivid the Alice-in-Wonderland financing of reclamation with an informative chart which shows reclamation project "repayment" dates running up to the middle of the next century — one project is due in 2081. With Western members of congress lobbying tirelessly, there seems no end in sight to this drain on the Treasury — unless, as Dr. Moley expresses the hope, the truth is recognized "in the states in which most of the taxes for the support of reclamation must be collected."

Book Review: Billions, Blunders and Baloney, by Eugene W. Castle. Published by Devin-Adair Co., 23 East 26th Street, New York 10, New York. Price: $3.50.

Mr. Castle's book exposes the waste of billions in our overseas operations and is quite likely to prove the most important book published in 1955. The author founded Castle Films, now America's largest producer of non-theatrical motion pictures. To gather the material for his book, he spent three years and travelled 75,000 miles overseas.

The book's advertising slogan tells the truth: "This book will make you mad."

The evidence offered will anger those who have been wondering how long we can go on spending — and being taxed — to support the world. Castle gives proof that foreigners resent rather than appreciate our aid. Recent newspaper stories from abroad say that the countries receiving the least from us are asking why other countries get more. They ask: are the appropriations to each country an index to our esteem? If that isn't the basis, then what is it?

It can't be need, because Britain with a relatively high standard of living has gotten more than most underdeveloped lands. It can't be danger of Communism because there is no visible danger of Communism in Israel, Spain, and Great Britain. It can't be military assistance because vast sums are going to Yugoslavia, India, Italy, France, countries that will be unreliable as military allies.

The indignation aroused by Castle's book could force Congress to stop the overseas spending orgy, which in all its forms runs to many billions per year.

Billions, Blunders and Baloney can be explosive in its effect upon Congress if the voters back home will read it, persuade others to read it, and write Washington about it.

If you want to do something today to end the foreign spending spree, you can buy Billions, Blunders and Baloney from us at the bookstore price of $3.50. With EACH order, we will give you *a free 16-weeks' subscription to HUMAN EVENTS.* You may have the 16 weeks added to your present subscription. Better yet, *send the subscription to some one else who should be reading HUMAN EVENTS.* In sending us your orders, specify the names and addresses of (1) those to whom you want books sent and (2) those to whom you want subscriptions sent, (unless they are one and the same.) Buy books and subscriptions for all you know who might be willing to join in building this bonfire under Congress.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $6. One year, $10. First class mail, one year, $11.50, six months, $6.75. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year $13; foreign (regular mail) one year, $12. Foreign airmail, $18. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. *Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.* Bound annual volume with index, $15.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XII, No. 9 HUMAN EVENTS February 26, 1955

LEFTWARD HO:
THE REPORT OF THE REECE COMMITTEE ON FOUNDATIONS

By WILLIS J. BALLINGER

THE MAJORITY REPORT of the Reece Committee on Foundations* is an exposure of the most effective technique used by Marxists to undermine a free society — manipulation of its intellectual life. For the now extensive group of *parentes indignati Americani* it constitutes a factual vindication of long-harbored suspicions that something was radically wrong in education. This Congressional Committee puts its finger on a ruling clique in large foundations and scholarly societies using the tax-exempt fortunes of dead industrial leaders to promote collectivism and world government.

The Cox Committee, its predecessor, operating for only six months in 1952, had found: (1) as early as 1936 the Kremlin had plotted the infiltration of American foundations; (2) seven important foundations had been infiltrated. Two of these subsequently lost their tax-exemption charters. The Reece Committee thus summarizes this important work of the Cox Committee:

> "We know from the evidence that the Communists succeeded in the case of seven foundations: the *Marshall Field Foundations, Garland Fund, John Simon Guggenheim Foundation, Heckscher Foundation, Robert Marshall Foundation, Rosenwald Fund* and the *Phelps Stokes Fund.*"

The Cox Committee (before expiring) had urged further inquiry into foundations. Early in 1953, Representative Carroll Reece headed a new Committee. Reece was a former university teacher himself, ex-Chairman of the Republican National Committee, had served nearly 30 years in the House and was one of the most respected men in Congress. Few committees, however, ever labored under more harassing conditions than the Reece body. Its requested appropriations were drastically slashed and its public hearings terminated by the obstructionist tactics of one Committee member — Representative Wayne Hays, Ohio New Deal Democrat.

Hays systematically interrupted witnesses (in one three-hour session he interrupted witnesses 246 times), called Chairman Reece "a liar and a coward," insulted noted scholars, (labeling them "crackpots" or as "dredged up" by the Committee staff.) The distinguished political scientist Professor Kenneth Colegrove, for eleven years Secretary-Treasurer of the American Political Science Association, wrote the Committee:

> "On thirty or more occasions Congressman Hays deliberately insulted the witness, and on numerous occasions he inferred that he [the witness] was a liar. I doubt whether the entire history of Congressional investigations will show a more unfair and cowardly attack on a witness than the treatment accorded Mr. Sargeant. Obviously no self-respecting scholar will care to testify before such a Committee under such conditions."

A majority of the Committee finally voted to close the public hearings because of the imminent risk of a violent scene.

Despite slashed appropriations and Mr. Hays, the Reece Committee was able to add substantially to the findings of the Cox Committee because of an efficient research staff which made a painstaking examination of foundation grants and reports and the testimony of outstanding scholars themselves. In addition to Professor Colegrove, the Committee heard Professor David Nelson Rowe, Director of Studies on Human Resources at Yale University; Professor Thomas Briggs, Professor Emeritus of Columbia University and one of the country's greatest

*House Report No. 2681, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Price: $1.25.

Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

experts on education; Professor A. H. Hobbs, one of the younger scholars whose book *Social Problems and Scientism* exposes the fallacious methodology of many social scientists attacking American civilization.

The Reece Committee says that there exists an intellectual cartel composed of giant foundations and their satellites (powerful scholarly organizations whom some foundations have financed to an extent of more than $60,000,000.) The cartel is possible because the disastrous inflation of the past 15 years has made it impossible for colleges to provide from their own funds for research. They must go to foundations for research funds and, says the Committee, the foundations do not often make grants "with no strings attached." Instead they dictate what is to be investigated, how and by whom. The result is characterized as a system of "genteel bribery."

The cartel, says the Committee, controls practically all social science research and such research is used to promote collectivism and world government. It discriminates, in general, against smaller institutions, although one scholar testified that the ablest PhD's come from smaller institutions. The cartel menaces the true teacher and scholar through its power to select research personnel and its large influence on the appointment of social science teachers. Through various channels, it has achieved "virtual control" of the great sums allotted by the Federal government for social science research (p. 18.)

In making its charges, the Reece Committee recognized the "magnificent" work of foundations in medicine, public health and natural science. Its accusations relate solely to the use of social science research for revolutionary purposes. The Committee does not say that foundation trustees or the members of great scholarly societies are in general aware of the cartel, or are accessories to its molding of public opinion leftwards. It puts the responsibility on "a small group of professional employees" (foundation bureaucrats) who exemplify control of organizations by the few — the demonstrated theory that an executive secretary may be the real boss.

Some critics may seek to discount the charge of an intellectual cartel, although the evidence of an unhealthy concert of action between foundations and scholarly organizations is indicated in their own official publications. But if there is no such cartel, two sixty-four dollar questions cannot be answered: (1) Why have giant foundations (and their satellites) failed to promote books or activities defending free enterprise, the Constitution, or American sovereignty which have been under violent attack by the radicals? (2) Why have these groups so consistently promoted books and activities favorable to Russia and Red China, advocating collectivism and promoting the world triumph of Marxism in a world government? There are certainly two sides to such issues. Why, therefore, has one side — the American side — been so sadly neglected?

Just a few samples in the Reece report are revealing as to the astounding left-wing bias in foundation social science activities:

(1) The Carnegie Foundation provided the American Historical Society with $340,000 to make a study of the social sciences. This voluminous work reached the conclusion that "our American way of life was a failure;" that it must give way to a collectivist society; and, that teachers "must now prepare the public for a New Order." Professor Harold Laski, the British socialist writer, called this study "an educational program for a socialist America," and the Carnegie Foundation after inspecting the work lauded its conclusions.

(2) The National Education Association (NEA) claims to represent nearly a million and a half teachers (in our secondary schools) with 66 state organizations and 4,434 affiliated associations. It received substantial grants from the Rockefeller General Education Board, although the NEA has been long pro-collectivist and since 1948 ardently for international government and UNESCO which it has long backed. The Report says, "Its adulation of the United Nations itself is almost childish." Its key operating official up to a few years ago was Willard Givens. Before joining the NEA in the thirties as an official, Givens advocated, as a local superintendent of education, "a nationwide campaign of adult education which will support

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President Roosevelt" in taking over and operating "the nation's credit agencies, basic industries and utilities."

(3) Foundations had contributed "$4,257,800 to the Progressive Education Association up to 1943." (J. B. Matthews describes progressive education as representing "moral and intellectual anarchy" which became "Communism's opportunity" in our educational life.) In *Progressive Education* (official magazine of the Association), the Committee cites a lead article (November, 1947) by the President of the Association "in which he recites that at the 1947 convention there were such speakers as W.E.B. DuBois (whose Communist front record is well known) and Langston Hughes, a Communist." Hughes is the author of the poem "Good Bye Christ" which says "make way (Christ) for a new guy with no religion at all — a real guy Marx, Communist Lenin, Peasant Stalin, Worker me."

The Committee also cited other articles by Professor Norman Woelfel in which the Professor says that the happy solution of the "social crisis" is a "collectivistic and classless society" and that "we must not shrink from the fact that it may require some *use of force against those at present privileged.*"

(4) American foundations gave over $4,000,000 to the London School of Economics when "it was the fountainhead of Fabian socialism."

(5) The Council of Learned Societies receives annually "large grants of money from foundations" and through it a great amount of social science research "is done or directed." The Committee says that for a long time "its Executive Secretary has been Mortimer Graves." The Counsel of the Cox Committee (Reece Report p. 55) "read from a long list of Communist fronts of which Mr. Graves was a member," but the Reece Committee specifically does not accuse Graves of being a Communist. The Council and the Institute of Pacific Relations made recommendations to the government for experts to be used in our occupation forces in Japan and Germany, the list of which the Committee found (Reece Report p. 57) "to be heavily salted with Communists and their supporters" and the Committee says (p. 56) that, "Graves failed to disclose the recommendations made by him to government agencies."

(6) The Social Science Research Council is "probably the greatest power in the social science field" and has been "supported" by numerous foundations. It sponsored (with foundation money) the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* regarded as the "Supreme Court" of the social sciences by researchers and students. Key man in its preparation was Alvin Johnson who admitted he had "two assistant editors who asserted they were socialists" and another who, Johnson was informed, "was a Communist." The Committee found the Encyclopedia heavily slanted to the left by socialist and Communist front contributors.

(7) The Committee found the Foreign Policy Association (financed by Carnegie, Rockefeller and Ford money) interested "only in promoting . . . globalism." Its Research Director has been for years Vera Micheles Dean (often an apologist for Russia) whom Professor Wittmer testified "had cooperated with 'the world's toughest Communist agents' in helping set up the Congress of American Women, a Communist front so worldwide in its ramifications that the House Un-American Activities Committee devoted a 114-page pamphlet to it" (pp. 175-6.) When Alger Hiss was President of the Carnegie Foundation he had endorsed the Foreign Policy Association (p. 184.)

(8) Paul Hoffman and Robert Maynard Hutchins, former head of Chicago University, have dominated the activities of the Ford Foundation. Hoffman is a former veteran office holder under the New Deal. Hutchins has a long record (pp. 38-39) which shows he has not regarded the Communist Party as "a clear and present danger," or Communists as "subversives," and has been a militant advocate of surrender of U.S. sovereignty to a world government. He is at present in charge of a $15,000,000 appropriation from the Ford Foundation which the Committee concludes (p. 113) is to be used to attack Congressional investigations of subversives. The Ford Foundation gave over a half a million to an organization headed by Professor Mortimer Adler, tireless crusader for world government, and over a million to the Friends Service Com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mittee which the Reece Committee says sponsored a Communist front, the World Youth Congress, sent a delegate to the World Youth Festival at Prague in 1947 (a "Communist affair") and has advocated recognition of Red China.

(9) Rockefeller money helped finance the "Building America textbooks" barred from California schools for their Marxian content and after it was found that "113 Communist front organizations had to do with some of their material . . . and that 50 Communist front authors were connected with it [the project]."

(10) In 1948, a Carnegie foundation financed a program "to educate for Americanism." The idea was to prepare a card index system of reference material for high school civic teachers. The Committee found "the preponderance" of leftist and internationalistic books recommended to be "overwhelming."

(11) A Carnegie foundation supplied $250,000 for a Swedish socialist, Gunnar Myrdal (described by Professor Colegrove as "very left-wing") to do a study on the Negro issue in America. Whatever the soundness of the Supreme Court decision on segregation it is curious and significant that it cited this socialist's study as authoritative.

(12) The Rockefeller Foundation, says the Committee, made possible the Kinsey studies on sex in which conclusions were reached that homosexual molesters of children "may have contributed favorably to their [the children's] later sociosexual development," and that premarital sex relations of women "provide an opportunity for the females to learn to adjust emotionally to various types of males."

(13) A Carnegie Foundation made a grant to the American Bar Association to study "genocide." When the Bar Association overwhelmingly condemned the proposed UN Genocide Pact, the foundation President complained that the grant had been "misused" by the Bar Association (p. 185.)

(14) The Alfred P. Sloan Foundation financed the Public Affairs Pamphlets with several hundred thousand dollars. For many years the editor of them was Maxwell Stewart, who "had taught in Moscow." In 1949 a House committee denounced the pamphlets, noting that they were being sold by "Communist book stores." They were also "sold in public libraries and frequently used in high schools." (Hearings,* p. 34.)

(15) For many years Evans Clark was the executive director of the 20th Century Fund (established by the Boston merchant Edward H. Filene in 1919) and "is still a trustee of the Fund." Prior to 1920 Clark had been Director of the Soviet Information Department in the U.S., and in 1920 had published his book *Facts and Fabrications About the Soviet Union.* The Committee said that Clark has been cited "a number of times" by the "Dies Committee and House Un-American Activities Committee."

(16) The Institute of Pacific Relations played a major role in the downfall of Nationalist China. A Senate Committee concludes "that, at least since the mid-thirties the net effect of IPR activities on United States public opinion has been pro-Communist." The IPR was heavily financed by foundations, including the Rockefeller Foundation which, despite a clear warning from Alfred Kohlberg in 1944, continued its support of the IPR.

(17) Carnegie foundations — investing large sums in "International Mind Alcoves" of Public Libraries, financing speakers to college campuses, founding professorships and "indoctrinating teachers," preparing material to be used in school textbooks, organizing "International Relations Clubs and Centers" all over the country — have for years carried on an intense campaign to surrender U.S. sovereignty to a world government.

The Minority Report of the Reece Committee completely ignores the mass of evidence assembled by the Committee staff showing foundation "leftism." It fails to meet the challenge of the data, *seriatim,* dismissing it with generalities. Instead, it comes to an over-all conclusion which is no more than a melodramatic repetition of the current clichés about congressional committees "creating a cloud of suspicion" and destroying "American constitutional liberty."

*Hearings, Vol. I — $2.50; Vol. II — $.70; available Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Additional Copies of Section II (the article section): 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $15; 1,000 for $25. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article (of which this section is an example). $10 per year. *Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED